

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/992,266

Applicant(s)

JAYAKUMAR ET AL.

Examiner

Warner Wong

Art Unit

2616

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Warner Wong.

(3) _____.

(2) James Henry.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 6, 11 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clarification of independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 for overcoming the 101 rejection and for allowability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Wong, Warner

From: Jim Henry [jim_henry@bstz.com]
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 8:03 PM
To: Wong, Warner
Subject: RE: Interview re 09/992,266

Examiner Wong:

I am in agreement with the substance of the amendment you propose for claim 1. Does the following amendment fully address the 101 issue as you proposed but perhaps in a more concise form by keeping the elements of the proposed wherein clause with the control word element?

1. (Currently Amended)

A method, comprising:

receiving an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) Adaptation Layer 5 (AAL5) Common Part Convergence Sublayer-Service Data Unit (CPCS-SDU) ~~AAL5 CPCS-SDU~~ at a router;
 encapsulating the AAL5 CPCS-SDU into an AAL5 enhanced packet at the router;
 generating ~~an MPLS~~ a MultiProtocol Label Switching (MPLS) packet from the AAL5 enhanced packet, wherein the AAL5 enhanced packet comprises an ATM header and a control ~~word~~ word, the control word comprising a transport type bit to properly identify whether the MPLS packet contains an ATM cell or an AAL5 CPCS-SDU; and
 routing the MPLS packet over an MPLS network.

Does this proposed amendment to claim 6 address the 101 issue for this claim?

6. (Currently Amended)

A method comprising:

receiving an MPLS packet at a router;
 decapsulating the MPLS packet when the MPLS packet is an AAL5 enhanced packet;
 producing an AAL5 CPCS-SDU from the AAL5 enhanced packet, wherein the AAL5 enhanced packet comprises an ATM header and a control word, the control word comprising a transport type bit to ~~indicate that~~ properly identify whether the MPLS packet ~~comprises~~ contains an ATM cell or an AAL5 CPCS-SDU.

Thank you for your helpful comments with regard to addressing these 101 issues.

Jim Henry
 Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
 3200 Park Center Drive, Suite 700
 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-7149
 Tel: (714) 557-3800
 Fax: (714) 557-3347

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This electronic message and its accompanying attachments (if any) contain information from the law firm of Blakely

5/9/2007

Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP that is confidential, attorney work product and/or subject to attorney-client privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the above attorney by telephone immediately.

-----Original Message-----

From: Wong, Warner [<mailto:Warner.Wong@USPTO.GOV>]

Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 8:34 AM

To: Jim Henry

Subject: RE: Interview re 09/992,266

Jim:

The proposed changes below have not fully address the 101 issue for yielding a useful, concrete & tangible result. Each independent (computer-implementable) methods/mediums claim is required to described a useful, concrete & tangible result, for example, having an ending phrase as follows:

claim 1:

A method, comprising:

- receiving an AAL5 CPCS-SDU at a router;
- encapsulating the AAL5 CPCS-SDU into an AAL5 enhanced packet at the router;
- generating an MPLS packet from the AAL5 enhanced packet, wherein the AAL5 enhanced packet comprised an ATM header and a control word, the control word comprising a transport type bit to indicated that the MPLS packet comprises an AAL5 CPCS-SDU; and
- routing the MPLS packet over an MPLS network, wherein the control word properly identifies whether the MPLS packet contains an ATM cell or an AAL CPCS-SDU. [from spec., paragraph 28]

Regards,

Warner Wong

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Henry [mailto:jim_henry@bstz.com]

Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 6:26 PM

To: Wong, Warner

Subject: Interview re 09/992,266

Examiner Wong:

In connection with the telephonic interview of 04/30/2007, applicant presents the following information:

Applicant proposes to address the rejection of claims 11 and 16 under 35 USC 101 as claiming a signal by amending the claims to claim "a computer readable storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions" because a signal cannot store instructions.

Applicant proposes to address the rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 USC 101 as lacking a tangible result by amending the claims to claim "a computer implemented method in which a computer performs the method

5/9/2007

comprising: ..." to make clear that a computer performs the claimed method and thereby produces a tangible result.

Applicant proposes to address the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Mauger (6,882,643) in view of Lundback (6,912,590) by amending claim 1 to add "the control word comprising a transport type bit to indicate that the MPLS packet comprises an AALS CPCS-SDU" following "a control word." This amendment conforms claim 1 to the elements of similar claims that the Examiner has found to be allowable, such as claim 21.

Applicant respectfully asks for the Examiner's comments on these proposed amendments as addressing all outstanding rejections in the application.

Jim Henry
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
3200 Park Center Drive, Suite 700
Costa Mesa, CA 92626-7149
Tel: (714) 557-3800
Fax: (714) 557-3347

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This electronic message and its accompanying attachments (if any) contain information from the law firm of Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP that is confidential, attorney work product and/or subject to attorney-client privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the above attorney by telephone immediately.